

(3.) *from J. W. L.*  
*(The author)* *Hull.*  
*Aug 22/57*

# “THE GREAT FACT”

EXAMINED AND DISPROVED;

OR,

## HOMŒOPATHY UNMASKED :

---

BY CHIRURGUS.

---

## A REPLY TO DR. HORNER.

---

LONDON: WHITTAKER & CO.

HULL: J. W. LENG, SAVILLE-STREET.

—  
1857.



*The writer of the following pages feels that he is so little known in this locality, that his name would add no weight to his publication, and his work must rest on its own merits alone.*

*He is also aware that as a comparative stranger—naturally seeking popularity—he might be suspected of writing to make himself notorious rather than to refute Dr. Horner, for public advertisement is absolutely necessary to the success of his undertaking.*


*To obviate this imputation he adopts for his title-page a nom-de-plume; but as he aims not at secrecy, nor desires to incur the charges often levelled against anonymous writers, he appends his initials and address for the information of those whom it may concern, and begs to subscribe himself*

*J. D.*

CHIRURGUS.

12, *Mason-Street,*

*June 26th, 1857.*



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b22379010>

"THE GREAT FACT" EXAMINED AND DISPROVED;

OR, HOMŒOPATHY UNMASKED.

---

A voluminous pamphlet has recently been published, by Dr. Horner, late the Senior Physician to the Infirmary, being a letter addressed to the Governors of that Institution, and extensively circulated amongst them, and the public at large. It informs them that he has become a convert to Homœopathy, which he terms "the *rational* system of medicine," and purports to set forth "the reason why."

The title of this book is striking, and immediately arrested our attention, because we remembered in years gone by, to have paid some little attention to this pretended science, and to have spent some time in studying the writings of its inventor and his followers; but failed to find therein anything sufficiently *rational* (to our benighted minds), to warrant us in trifling with human life and human suffering, by giving it what is called a practical trial.

Curiously enough our Author went through this same process some ten years ago and with the same result. We now learn that this was because of his being "blinded by prejudice and ignorance," which prevented him from seeing the "*truth*," (a term much used in this book); and having quoted the opinion of a modern philosopher "that an enlightened mind does receive upon testimony, statements which are rejected by the vulgar as totally incredible,"—he congratulates himself on the enlightenment his own mind has lately undergone, "confesses" (to us it partakes more of the character of a boast) "that whereas he was blind now he sees," and he then proceeds to shew us *in what manner* he "happily became enlightened to the truth of Homœopathy."

Anxious therefore to have our own eyes opened, we have carefully perused this book, but we are fain to confess, that as yet no light of "truth" as herein set forth has dawned upon us. We are still blind. One thing however we clearly see—it is a harsh conclusion but inevitable—that this book was not published to enlighten the profession (to which we belong), but to advertise the Author and mislead the public; and we pledge ourselves to substantiate this statement by cogent evidence.

Our suspicions on this point were first excited, by observing, that although our Author claims for his newly adopted system that it is "the *rational* system," yet he ignores and even deprecates all *argument* or *reasoning* in the matter, and appeals solely to what he calls "facts." These "facts" consist principally of marvellous cures of disease, which he does not attempt to explain or to account for rationally, although many of them are sufficiently wonderful, and far passing the comprehension of such ordinary and vulgar minds as ourselves.

Yet in justice to our own penetration, we may here observe, that we were not altogether led away by this big letter announcement of "the *rational system* of medicine," holding as it does in terrorem over the head of every doubter or opponent, the charge of irrationality; for we saw at once, that it was merely *begging the whole question*, at the outset, and on the very threshold of debate. We remembered that every man, even a lunatic, believes himself to be rational; and that every *honest* man believes that the views which he holds are rational views (no matter the subject under consideration), his opinions are the right opinions, (whenever he has made his mind to any at all), and are founded on conviction for the time being, however slight may be in reality the foundations of his belief. No matter what fallacies he may credit, or what absurd notions he may entertain, until he is convinced to the contrary, his is "the *rational system*." With conviction of error follows change of opinion, and though his views may now be antagonistic to his previous notions, aye and even still erroneous, needing correction, and open thereto, yet are they for the present to *his* mind rational, viz., reasonable,—agreeable to his reason.

The use of such a word is therefore manifestly improper, in treating of any subject which admits of difference of opinion, and has really as little force or meaning, as the word *truth* so freely and frequently made use of in this letter,—and which as here employed, is nothing more than the expression of opinion on the part of the writer,—or as another word of the same class used by our Author a little further on, viz., Orthodox, which we take it means our dox,—Heterodox, being the dox of our opponent.

But if by rational we are to understand, supported or proved, by reasoning, then is the term a gross and glaring solecism—a palpable contradiction of the whole tenor of our Author's argument—for we are told that in this search after truth,—in this exploration of the well,—he “discarded as irrelevant to his purpose the refinements and subtleties of theories,” &c., and “sought only the practical proof.” Again in italics at page 43, “Homœopathy is a fact resting upon evidence, and not upon mere reasoning.” “Homœopathists rest their whole on experimental testimony, but the profession only responds with cunning arguments or subtle reasoning.” This treatment of the subject is on the whole judicious, for the rational arguments in favor of Homœopathy are not worth a straw, and have been too often refuted to be worthy of reiteration, and we think our Author has acted wisely in confining his testimony as to the grounds of his belief to empirical cures alone.

By the way, he objects to the term *empirical* as inapplicable to Homœopathy. Let him not do this again, nor shrink from the application of it to himself, and to his system of practising it. The position he boastfully assumes, is exactly expressed by the word *Empiric*, and by no other word in the English language. Here is its dictionary meaning—A trier or experimenter, *a person who ventures upon observation alone*; a quack. Surely this cap will fit—rather too tightly for comfort perhaps.

Shut out then from any discussion, of the theory, or rationale of Homœopathy, we—still in search of truth—have thought it our duty to accept our Author's “challenge of full investigation” and “the test of proof,” not however by an experimental trial of his



globules, but by a strict examination of his alleged "facts." And on these matters we have some startling revelations to make. The Doctor boasts that his eyes are already open, and we opine that he will open them wider still, when he reads what we have to say about some of his statements.

It is hard to an honest and healthy mind, to suspect a man of falsehood, and harder still to convict him thereof, and as he states most solemnly, that "he has not *knowingly* advanced one single statement that is not in strict accordance with facts," we must give credence to this assertion, though we cannot acquit him of rash and culpable carelessness, which in this case "is a crime against humanity itself"—and we shall hold ourselves entitled to the Doctor's eternal gratitude, for the proofs we bring of his self-deception—for the opportunity we give him of "explaining away" the astounding errors into which he has fallen—and above all for *publishing* this contradiction, which as an honest man he would immediately feel himself called upon to do, but that we have saved him that trouble.

The numerous fallacies and grievous mis-statements which our enquiries have brought to our knowledge, render it incumbent on us "to speak that which we do know and testify that we have seen" for the *further* enlightenment of our Author and his readers as to what is really *the truth* of this matter. Hence the present essay and its publication.

"The facts" here narrated may be considered under the following heads :—

- I.—Our Author's inducements for undertaking the investigation which has led to his conversion.
- II.—The experiments and their results.
- III.—"The testimony of others and the witness of public statistics," our Author's own words.
- IV.—A few minor points not included in the foregoing divisions.

The first head requires but brief notice.

Dr. Horner's letter *appears* to have been hastily or at least



carelessly put together, and its arrangement is confused and intricate. This *may* however have been done designedly, as it is thereby rendered more difficult of analysis and criticism, and its fallacies are more likely to pass muster with the mere cursory reader. But it has this great disadvantage to the writer. It betrays him into perpetual incongruities, and strange self-contradictions, of which we have many illustrations in store.

This statement of motives is one.

At page 5 we are told that he was prompted to enquire into the merits of Homœopathy because he was dissatisfied with the old system of medicine, and hoped to find something better in the new system. At page 7 he writes, that he set out with the *expectation* of unmasking a fallacy, and at page 8,—aye almost before he has turned over leaf,—this expectation has become desire and strong inducement—for he there states “that he felt the time had arrived when something must be done” “to check the onward spread of Homœopathy,” “the public mind was to be disabused and disinfected” with reference to it. How contradictory and incompatible are these alleged motives, when separated from the rodomontade by which they are surrounded and obscured and placed side by side. Dissatisfied with, and sceptical of, his earlier creed—in the practice of which by the way he boasts of discernment and success above his fellows,—yet anxious to crush and exterminate “the new system” \* which promises something better. What a queer state of mind must a man be in, to entertain and to act upon, such incoherent reasons as these. Are we not called on narrowly to scan, both his statements and his arguments,—his “facts” and his deductions,—his logic and his conclusions, before we can concede much to his convictions. He must shew us

\* We use this term under protest,—Homœopathy has not even the charm of novelty to recommend it, however *new* it may be to Dr. Horner. Hahnemann, its inventor, first promulgates his doctrines in 1796, and “The Organon,” his greatest work,—the text-book of his disciples,—was first published in 1805; possibly about the same that another interesting and notable event occurred, to wit—the birth of Dr. Horner.

a strong case before we can allow that his judgement is entitled to exercise any influence over the opinions and belief of other men, whom he now claims to enlighten and instruct.

So pass we on to consider secondly—The Study and its results. Of which he writes: “Honestly divesting my mind as far as I was able to do of all prejudice against it”—it would be interesting to know by what process this was accomplished—he “first diligently searched and studied *all* the best works *on* the subject,” from which he appears to have gained a vast amount of useful information, and to have qualified himself himself for conducting his “lengthened and practical enquiry” which he commences forthwith. And his first discovery was “his own ignorance as to what Homœopathy really was” and “how he had misjudged and misrepresented it.” This is a degrading confession on the part of a man who professes to have studied the subject ten years ago. But such an admission of folly and presumption on his own part, is surely not a sufficient justification for bringing the same charge against his professional brethren. Had he included in his list of works *on* the subject, some of the books *against* it, and had he recalled to mind the speeches delivered at the Brighton Meeting of the Provincial Medical Association, at which he presided, when—as he dolefully moralizing, tells us—Homœopathy was discussed and condemned, he would scarcely have uttered this wholesale calumny against the profession at large, of passing judgment on the thing in ignorance and without investigation. We deny the justice of this charge. We have ourselves wasted much time over this matter, and we know many who have studied it both theoretically and practically, and have been driven to the conclusion that “there is nothing in it.”

As an illustration of this culpable ignorance on the part of both the public and the profession, we are told “that it is thought that Homœopathy mainly consists in giving small or infinitesimal doses of medicine.” “Now this magnitude of the dose” he continues “has nothing whatever to do with the principle of this science.” “The principle, the very essence of Homœopathy, lies in the law of simile.”

It may be very convenient to Dr. Horner thus to shuffle out of this question of infinitesimal doses—the only part of the subject which the public can understand—and to abandon a position he might find it difficult to defend. We cannot so pass it over. This is a fallacy which demands exposure. In a practical science such as medicine, a *principle* is a nonentity—a very ignis fatuus, except inasmuch as it *influences practice* and produces results. On the next page Dr. Horner tells us, that he uses nothing but *globules*, and in a note at page 28, he speaks of prescribing for a lady, “Nux Vomica in the dose of *one millionth part* of a grain,” so that *this* potent agent is, to say the least of it, the connecting link between his so-called principle and his practice, and unless Homœopathy consists *altogether* of this imaginary principle, “*the essence of Homœopathy*” is *not* the theoretical law of simile, but the *globule* by which this law is carried into practice.

And a very glorious weapon it is. It consists, *as far as it admits of proof*, of nought but Sugar of Milk. It *should* contain also the *millionth, billionth, nonillionth*, or it may be *trillionth* part of some medicine. Nux Vomica, Mercury, Crabs' claws, Brimstone, Charcoal—the most active and the most innocuous agents—are alike subjected to a process of interminable dilution; and it is this inconceivable nothingness, which we are called on to endue with remedial powers and to administer for the cure of disease; aye, foresooth, and our choice of the right globule has to be *regulated by a principle*—a mighty and all-important principle—even this law of simile in which lies “the very essence of Homœopathy.”

Waiving this disquisition, we now approach the most momentous part of this history, the cases—or what, in this instance, appears to be the same thing—the cures. We are told that his opportunities have been manifold, unlimited almost. “He has prescribed globules many thousands of times;” “a detail of cases so treated would fill a volume;” and in one place mention is made of “the cures *I performed* in the first 600 cases.” Also, that this practical enquiry has been conducted in the strictest and most unexceptionable manner: thus “careful notes were kept; all the symptoms of the disease were”

primarily registered, and the effect of every medicine that was administered, and every change of symptoms noted." This is most praiseworthy, painstaking, and reliable—provided always, that there is no exaggeration or inaccuracy here. This proviso will, perhaps, be justified by us, and pardoned by the reader, when we come to point out the errors which everywhere exist in the detailed cases.

From all this tremendous experience, general deductions are drawn, and a few special cases are narrated at length to support and prove them. Here, surely, we shall meet with overwhelming testimony,—with proof that admits of no doubt, with evidence free from fallacy—in short, with truth (that much abused word) undeniable and indubitable. Let the sequel shew.

Our Author says "he will content himself with simply citing a few *examples of that testimony* on which his conviction is founded." He forthwith proceeds to assure us, that he saw "Chronic diseases rapidly cured by the Homœopathic medicines," where the old system had failed in the hands of other practitioners, and of himself too. Likewise "cases of Acute Inflammation of the Vital Organs, as of the Brain, the Lungs, the Stomach, the Bowels," also cured. Next he informs us that it is in these latter (the Acute Inflammatory cases), "that the curative action of Homœopathic remedies is most rapid and decided;" and he pours out a phial of wrath against the practitioners of the old school for venturing to object to this.

It is impossible to deal critically with such loose generalization as this; it may all be true, and in its detail and progress, may have been very convincing to the Author; but we object *in toto* to its being considered *testimony*, or *evidence*, to any one besides himself. It is mere assertion, and, though often repeated in succeeding pages, it amounts to nothing in the way of proof. It is supported by no collateral or circumstantial evidence whatever.

Is it not strange, is it not striking, that no cases of these formidable and dangerous diseases—Inflammation of the Brain, the Stomach, the Lungs, the Bowels—are narrated throughout the book? Surely, from the large number treated, *some* such might



have been selected for special detail ; some of these might have been considered “ important and interesting cases,” and, as such, worthy of publication : they might, at least, have afforded us valuable and important testimony.

Instead of this, we are told that in some cases, simply sugar of milk was given, and, of course—why this is added we know not—without result ; but the proper remedy being selected, a cure was effected. In other cases, favourable effects were being produced by Homœopathic medicines, when—“ unknown to the patient ”—the “ unmedicated powder ” was for a time substituted, and the amendment ceased ; but the medicated globule being resumed, “ again improvement began.” In some, again, Homœopathic medicines and the old approved method of treatment were used alternately, with striking results in favour of the globule.

This is considered *more definite* description. Yet we must again object, that it is all vague, *indefinite*, unsubstantial. We can well understand why no cases are given here. Who are the persons thus *experimented* on ? Of what class were they—Hospital, paying, or gratuitous patients—who were thus *trifled with, practised on*, and “ *put to the proof*,” unknown to themselves ? Whoever they were, we imagine they went to Dr. Horner to be healed, and not to be humbugged, and they “ will now read it in this letter.” Oh that we had been an *interesting case* in the hands of Dr. Horner in the happy days of “ the practical and lengthened enquiry ! ”

At length we approach the actual narration of cases. They are fifteen in all ; five of these we have been able (not without much difficulty) to examine for ourselves and “ put to the proof.” With these we will commence, and we beg to direct special attention to our statements which are based on the highest possible authority.

A man who had suffered for four years from pain in the bladder, with bloody urine, &c., was admitted into the Infirmary under Dr. Horner. One-drop doses of Tincture of Cantharides, were prescribed—on Homœopathic principles we are told—and this *cured* the patient. Oh ! Doctor, Doctor, “ how is this to be got over.” The man *took two doses of this medicine*, and being in great suffering, reported himself

to the House Surgeon, who, in the proper exercise of his functions, and as in duty bound, prescribed something for the urgency of the moment, and his prescription—alas, it was that hideous thing “a mixture of several medicines to fight together in the dark”—afforded so much relief that its use was continued *and it cured* the patient.

By an unfortunate inadvertency no entry of this change was made in Dr. Horner's case book, and he—careful observer—satisfied with the progress of the case made no enquiry, and innocently believed that his Spanish fly had wrought the cure. “And he will now read it in this letter.” We regret, in common with others more intimately concerned, that the Doctor was so unwittingly deceived; perchance this case had much to do with his conversion—but this great fact must not be lost sight of—for it rests on irresistible and perfectly unobjectionable evidence—this much boasted and very remarkable case did *not* recover under the Homœopathic remedy, but under the old, much maligned system, which it seems does sometimes afford relief to suffering humanity. It points out too the sources of fallacy to which a man may be exposed—how very easy it is to be mistaken in matters of medical observation, and it justifies us in demanding of Dr. Horner something more than his own ipse dixit before we admit his “proof of truth.” May we not also exclaim with him “*ex uno disce omnes.*”

But we have more of the same sort to tell.

The second case (in the Infirmary) is as palpable a cure of nature's own as it is possible to conceive. The man gets rid of a calculus which had troubled him for years, and the medicine which he happened to be taking at the time is to have the credit of curing him.\* Verily this word *cure* is *also* much abused throughout this letter.

\* A strange little ominous tell-tale word occurs in the narration of this case. It may not mean much, yet it appears to indicate a great deal. At page 18, we read, “I THINK a seton had also been set.” *Think* is a very queer word for a man to use in a matter like this,—when he boasts of “careful notes,” and especially of accurate registration of previous histories and symptoms.

Such cases happen every day, and often impose upon patients and their friends, and give them a more exalted opinion of their medical adviser than he would claim for himself. It is a very common thing for a medical man to gain inordinate credit, aye, and often a good patient too, from some such happy accident as this : but it is a mark of ignorance, bad taste, or dishonesty, to find him boasting of such cases as cures, when *he* well knows they are not *cures*, but *recoveries*.

Yet, at page 54, we meet with another of those wholesale accusations—in which this writer so greatly delights—against “practitioners of the *old school*” of claiming as their own, these natural cures. Now, Dr. Horner must be well aware that this is an old argument against Homœopathy. It is based, too, on one of the dogmas of Hahnemann, which appears to have been invented expressly to sustain this claim ; and he ought to have known the absurdity of this *tu quoque* style of reasoning. Of course, as he has had the first word, we are open to the same charge ; yet we must, in this instance, turn his own weapons against himself, and ask him the foundations of his belief that this Homœopathic remedy “acted directly upon the part implicated,” and on what grounds he claims to have *cured* this patient ? and also some others we shall have to allude to hereafter.

We dismiss briefly “the third case of cure within the Infirmary,” by the assertion, founded on the highest authority, that this man is not cured at all. He is not even relieved. He is still under treatment ; still taking his much lauded Homœopathic remedy ; and is now as bad, or nearly so, as when he entered the Infirmary.

The next case to which we have to allude is that of Mrs. Maxwell, which is another of nature’s cures ; exaggerated, dressed up for print, and claimed by the Doctor on behalf of his globules.

Here is testimony on this matter. It is from the Physician alluded to in Dr. Horner’s letter, as having been “called in” prior to himself. “The case of Mrs. Maxwell, detailed in Dr. Horner’s pamphlet with “so little regard to professional decency or usage, was one of old “bronchitis recurring in a patient advanced in life and very feeble.



“As my suggestions for her relief were not adopted, I took my leave after two visits, and informed the friends that I considered the case a very precarious one. *I entirely deny that I ever thought or said to any one that the patient could not recover.* Such cases constitute a large proportion of those which come under our notice in the winter season: the result depends chiefly on the vigour of the natural powers, and the use of medicine is to assist the restorative effort. No conscientious man could claim *the cure* of such cases, whatever system of treatment he adopted. (Signed) HENRY COOPER.”

The case in a neighbouring town, well known to friends and relatives in Hull, is, by common consent, referred to a lady at Beverley, and the Surgeon in attendance was Dr. Sandwith, of that place, who thus writes—“I am sorry to say Dr. Horner, in the case published by him in page 25 of his pamphlet, has made an unfair statement, not I believe intentionally, but from forgetfulness of all the circumstances.” Here follows a minute detail, of which this is a summary. The remedy suggested by Dr. Horner was Tincture of Aconite in  $\frac{1}{2}$  drop doses. This was not to supersede other medicines, but to be given along with some Pills—also, be it remarked, a fresh prescription—sanctioned by Dr. Horner. The patient took one ( $\frac{1}{2}$  drop) dose of the Aconite,—the so-called Homœopathic remedy,—and “perceiving no effect from it, *could not be prevailed on to take another,*” and actually she never did take another dose. The other remedies were persevered with for some days until amendment was decided—tonics were substituted in the usual course, and “the patient’s health was speedily restored.”

What a ludicrous tale is Dr. Horner’s in the face of such evidence as this! How destructive to his cause is such raving as the following: “I am as certain as that I now write these words, that this lady’s life was saved by a *few doses* of the Homœopathic remedy. It was continued *three* days; *one day too long*, as it had put a stop to diseased action; and was beginning to produce its own medicinal effect.”

Will not the reader exclaim with us, what is *fact*—what is *truth*—for such Dr. Horner considers *his* narrative of these cases.

How opportune, how appropriate, how convincing must now appear the three succeeding pages, filled with reiterated laudation of Homœopathy, and idle vaunts of its superiority over the old system,—repetition *usque ad nauseam* of the sincerity of his own belief therein,—mingled with the customary abuse of medical men in general, and with wailing over their blindness and obduracy,—interlarded also with speculative rejoicing and premature gladness “at the good time coming”—when they too will see.

Here then are five cases (of the fifteen) which we have been able to identify and to investigate—with this very remarkable result—two are clearly nature’s cures, claimed by the Doctor as his own—Mrs. Maxwell and the man in the Infirmary who passed a calculus. One is not cured at all—the man with skin disease. And two were cured by *other medicines altogether*—in one case, only one, and in the other case, but two doses of the remedy prescribed on the Homœopathic principle being taken by the patients. Such a result is indeed startling. Is it not strange, is it not wonderful, that not *one* of these cases will bear the test of examination. Not one is accurate or reliable, or of the smallest value as testimony or proof.

The other ten cases we might pass over with our Author’s maxim strongly multiplied—from *five* samples judge the rest—but we need them to prove a statement we made at the outset, and which is of considerable importance. We refer to the opinion we previously expressed as to the real intent and design of this letter, viz., to attract and astonish the general reader, and not to instruct or convince the medical man.

The strong point in proof of this is the manner and style in which these cases are narrated. They are far too marvellous,—too wonderful,—they prove too much a great deal. Even Homœopathy itself never before performed cures so rapid, so sudden, so decided.

This new disciple,—this fledgling Homœopath,—this student of a few months,—puts to shame all his compeers, and far outstrips all his brethren of the globulistic craft in the marvels

he has wrought. He has a special power over "throat and nose cases," which he describes with much pathos and pride. Sciatica, of a year, yields in three weeks;—an old head-ache is cured in two weeks;—croup is mere child's play, it is cured twice over in a few hours;—coughs vanish as by magic, and cod liver oil is entirely out-done. And as a climax he has healed a cripple—he has "made a miracle"—such as has not been done since the days of Peter and Paul. †

There is one striking feature about all the cases as here detailed. We mean the exact similarity they bear to the cures daily advertised by Holloway, Morrison, Barron Taylor, Dr. Hamilton, *et hoc genus omne*. There is a strong family likeness about quackish advertisements. The cases have always been to many doctors, and been "given up" by them—turned out of Hospitals incurable, and so forth, until at last, heaven directed, they have fallen in with *the remedy*, which cures them in a few weeks or even days. Such too are the leading traits of Dr. Horner's cases. For Horner read Holloway—for "Homœopathic Medicines" substitute Ointment and Pills—and we have, in any one of them, a very model case for this prince of advertising quacks.

Dr. Horner may believe that his position and character are sufficient to substantiate his statements, and that we are not justified in ranking his testimony with that of Holloway & Co. Allow us therefore to say, that it is not his actual veracity we impugn (so far at least as his cases are concerned), but his accuracy of observation and recollection;

† We are bound, however, to state that there is some little obscurity about the case of this poor lame lad. We have hitherto avoided all criticism of the learned Doctor's English—which is often of an eccentric sort;—and, when we have fully understood his meaning, we have—according to the prayer of Sancho Panza, in similar circumstances—shunned fault-finding with modes of expression, and it is only because we are in doubt here that we ask an explanation. We read that this child "came cheerfully, hopping with its crutch, into my room to thank me for mending *it*." Grammatically this *it* clearly refers to the crutch. Yet we can hardly suppose this to be what he intends to tell us. His grammar, like his logic, is frequently loose and undecided.

and to remind him that, whereas he promised us proof, he gives us nothing but assertion. He might have produced names, dates, and a variety of collateral evidence—especially in his Infirmary cases—but all that he gives us is a repetition of,—I saw it and I say it,—and we submit we have sufficiently shewn what reliance is to be placed on that.

Medical men are in the constant habit of publishing their important and interesting cases for the benefit of the profession at large ; but they are told, in a style very different to that here made use of. Where are the “careful notes (which we are told) were kept,” in which “all the symptoms of the disease were primarily registered, and the effect of every medicine that was administered and every change of symptoms noted.” This is just the kind of information which medical men are accustomed to furnish to each other, and above all things they mention *the remedies they employ*. These Dr. Horner has on the present occasion studiously withheld—for reasons best known to himself—on which point we shall have more to say hereafter ; for the present, we content ourselves with repeating that the medical value of these cases, to the medical mind, is absolutely nil. They teach us nothing—they prove nothing—they convince us of nothing.

Yet if Dr. Horner is so certain of the truth of his system, and of the incalculable benefits it is destined to confer upon mankind, should he not be aiding and abetting that spread of Homœopathy amongst medical men, which he so devoutly desires and confidently prognosticates, by giving *us* some evidence on which *we* could rely,—something professional, not quackish,—something addressed to his poor benighted brethren, and not to the public, who, as he well knows, are easily deceived, and led away in these matters which they cannot fully understand.

Let him not scorn to lend a helping hand in that great and glorious work ; let him devote his energies towards the fulfilment of his own prophecy ; let him endeavour, by all the means in his power, to hasten that happy day, when the leech and the lancet shall be heard of no more ; when “the blessings of Homœopathy” shall be univer-

sally recognized, and taught in all Colleges, Hospitals, and Medical Schools; when the sublime law of simile shall be our guiding star, our only and all-sufficient medical principle; when the dear delightful globule, which goes direct to the part, shall be the unquestioned and indubitable cure; neither shall there be any more retention or accumulation of drugs, to the destruction of "mental or bodily health." And he may rest assured that this desirable end is to be brought about by the conviction of the *medical profession*—the conversion of *the public* will then need no care or trouble, for it follows as a consequence.

But we must push this point a little further. It is disagreeable, it is painful to our feelings; but, having undertaken the task, we cannot blench from it. We have hitherto been dealing with errors which, with others yet to be exposed, may *possibly* be the result of carelessness, accident, or self-deception. But none of these can excuse the culpable folly to which we must now allude. Has Dr. Horner friends? let them look to this.

At page 13, we are told he selected "three cases of *Consumption* where the symptoms were of a decided character;" and "marked, unmistakable improvement followed" the use of his remedies. But at page 42, occurs this very remarkable statement—"In the last three months, I have had the deep gratification of perfectly restoring eight cases, which had been declared to be hopeless and incurable *Consumption* by their medical attendants. And four other "hopeless" cases of *Consumption* are at this present time steadily progressing to recovery." We have said this is a wonderful statement. We are not now going to question its truth or doubt its accuracy; but we say to Dr. Horner, in sober earnestness—aye, and in some shape or other, we expect an answer too—What is your remedy? How do you cure *Consumption*?

We have hitherto avoided harsh terms, but we *must* denounce this unpardonable iniquity,—this dallying with human life,—this trifling with the direst disease to which our poor mortal frame is liable, which numbers more victims than cholera, and is more destructive than the plague—and we ask, How dare you parade your



triumphs to the world ;—how dare you publish your cures of this disease, without *at the same time* telling us the means made use of ? We say at the *same time*, for it is already too late in some—perhaps in many cases—to remedy this fatal, this sad omission. Since the publication of this letter, we have ourselves lost three patients by consumption, and other three are hastening to the grave. This is far too serious a question to be lightly treated ; nor does it need any fine writing to enhance its claims to attention and to answer—How are these poor hapless mortals to be rescued from their impending fate. Tell us, in pity, tell us, aye and that right soon. Do not reply to us by such vague generality—“as Homœopathic medicines,” “Homœopathic remedies,” “Homœopathic system,” and so on. Do not ask us to wade through the ponderous volumes of Homœopathic lore, to seek and find out for ourselves. Here is an opportunity for the exercise of that simple candour which you boast. Name your remedies and their application in such a way as will admit of their practical use,—do this, if you can, as a professional man ought,—and we pledge ourselves to put them to the practical proof.

And if these things are true, then will we promise you a niche in the temple of fame, by the side of Harvey, Galileo, and Jenner, whose martyrdom and persecution you emulate, yet deplore—we promise you honour and respect more pure, more noble than a Nelson or a Wellington could claim—then shall Hull erect to you, her worthier son, a monument more exalted than that of Wilberforce—you too shall go down to posterity as a benefactor to your race, as an emancipator of mankind from worse than negro slavery. Ages yet unborn shall revere and bless your sacred name, and the glories of Hahnemann himself shall fade beside your own.

But if these things are not so,—and we cannot but express our fears and our doubts upon the point,—or if Dr. Horner still decline to tell us his remedies,—then must we pass upon him his own judgment that “this is a crime against humanity itself,” and we say of him, as Carlyle said of another arch imposter to whom a monument was proposed, “Sink him a coal-shaft rather.”

Passing by for the present some minor points, which we reserve

for future notice, if time and space permit, we reach the third division of our enquiry,

“The testimony of others, and the witness of public statistics,” as our Author expresses it.

He commences in this way, “The evidence of individuals cited, shall be that of the old school; and I first notice the admission of a confessed opponent—the author of the ‘Fallacies of Homœopathy’—(whose work, my friend Mr. Sharpe, has shown to be one huge fallacy itself.)” Forgetting then that by such an estimate of Dr. Routh’s work, he brow-beats his own witness and entirely destroys the value of the evidence which he seeks to extract from him, he states that Dr. Routh adopts in his own practice the Homœopathic cure for inflammation of the lungs; recommends it to others, and has not used the lancet since. We have a letter from Dr. Routh himself (good authority this, equal perhaps to the assertion of Dr. Horner.) He states that it is *untrue* that he never bleeds—although in common with the majority of the profession, he finds the use of the lancet less called for than formerly, owing to a well-known and almost universally recognised change in the type of disease. He commonly uses in inflammation of the lungs “a very old allopathic remedy” “long known to the profession,” and “of proved efficacy.”—So much for his practice,—now for his statistics, which we find some pages further on, and which are ushered in by a repetition of the mis-statements concerning his practice already contradicted.

This, by the way, is a very favourite dodge of our Author. He first makes a loose vague sort of statement, about some person or thing, and promises proof hereafter—he wanders off to some other topic for a few pages,—then re-asserts his former statement, and pretends to believe that he has proved it. Numerous instances of this occur throughout the book. This about Dr. Routh is one. Mr. Liston is so mentioned in four separate places: but the retention of drugs, to be presently noticed, is the most marked illustration of this reiteration mistaken for proof.

Of these statistics, he thus writes—“As it is always best to take the testimony of an opponent, I quote the statistics of a few



diseases drawn from Dr. Routh's "Fallacies of Homœopathy." "As these statistics were the Doctor's own,"—"we may safely assume their accuracy."

We almost shrink from replying to this for very shame on behalf of our profession; that one, who formerly held, and still would claim, a respectable standing amongst ourselves, should be subjected to such an exposure. Will it be believed—this table of statistics, shewing such magnificent results in favour of Homœopathy, so far from being *Dr. Routh's own* is quoted by him from Homœopathic publications, for the *express purpose* of exposing its inaccuracy? And, to our benighted minds, he does appear to prove that they are fallacious, fabricated, and false.

This, however, is not the point. What does Dr. Horner mean by the assertion, "these statistics are the Doctor's own." Said we not truly, at the beginning, this man writes to mislead the public. How few that read Dr. Horner's book have the opportunity to test this matter; how incumbent on us is it to contradict such barefaced deception, which doubtless has deceived and astonished many! What will Dr. Horner's friends say to this? Can they forgive him for thus leading them into error? What credence can they give to his statements for the future. Such examples as this must not be lightly passed over: this nail must be clinched, and Dr. Horner must pay the penalty for his untruthfulness. For the future he must prove whatever he expects us to believe; he must excuse us for doubting everything he asserts, and for scanning narrowly any evidence he may adduce. This is strong language, certainly; but we believe it is fully justified by what we have already written, and by more that yet remains behind. The very title of Dr. Routh's book ought to have prevented such an error, but this, we charitably hope, Dr. Horner never saw. Here it is in full: "On the Fallacies of Homœopathy, and the imperfect statistical enquiries on which the result of that practice are estimated." Why the real object of the book, the express intention with which it is written is what?—to expose and refute these very statistics. It is much to the purpose too. If Dr. Horner would like to read it, we shall be happy to lend it to him.

The next name brought upon the stage, to bear testimony to the truth of Homœopathy, is that of Mr. Liston, one of our departed great ones, whose loss we still mourn; and sorry are we to find, that Dr. Horner has so forgotten himself as to traduce and malign the professional character of a dead man, in the way that we believe he has done here. He is mentioned four times over as a supporter and practiser of Homœopathy. We content ourselves with one quotation: it will be found in the Appendix. "He (Liston) not only practised Homœopathy in the University College Hospital, towards the close of his life, but, *as I have already told you*, testified to its wonderful efficacy, and in his Lectures to the Students, recommended them to investigate it." Yes, Dr. Horner, you *have already told us* so many things which we have proved to be false, that we are justified in asking your authority for this statement. We are told of a lecture to Students, and "a letter to Dr. Quin, *now published*" (six or seven years after Liston's death.) Let them be produced that we may see them.

We read these statements about Mr. Liston with astonishment and incredulity; and we possessed *peculiar facilities* for obtaining strong evidence—either to refute or confirm them—in the friendship of a gentleman from whose letter we quote below. It was this which first led us to enter upon this investigation, and the first step we took was to write to Mr. Cadge, and we copied every word of Dr. Horner's letter that refers to Mr. Liston.

We may be asked, who is Mr. Cadge? He was first—solely from his zeal, industry and ability—a favorite pupil of Mr. Liston, afterwards his House-Surgeon at University College Hospital, subsequently Demonstrator of Anatomy at and Assistant-Surgeon to the same Institution, and the private assistant and intimate friend of Mr. Liston to the day of his death, and on him devolved the melancholy duty of making the post-mortem examination of his friend. He is now Assistant-Surgeon to the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital, and one of the leading practitioners of that city.

Here are extracts from Mr. Cadge's reply to our enquiries, and

we regret that our space does not admit of its being given entire.

"I have read, with no little amazement, the extracts from Dr. Horner's pamphlet, in which he asserts that the late Mr. Liston practised Homœopathy, and testified to its wonderful efficacy, towards the close of his life, in University College Hospital. During this time I lived in the closest intimacy with Mr. Liston. I was his House-Surgeon, and subsequently his private assistant, and I am therefore in a position to speak on this matter. For a considerable period of the time referred to, every prescription of his at University College Hospital passed through my hands, and I beg to say emphatically, that Dr. Horner's assertion is *simply untrue*, and I challenge him to shew that Mr. Liston ever prescribed a Homœopathic dose of any remedy in University College Hospital." After alluding to the alleged intimacy with Dr. Quin (which is perfectly true), he goes on—"If, however, he was ever induced to try some few Homœopathic remedies, then it is certain that he soon discovered the worthlessness of this system as a means of cure, for it is incontestably true that he did not continue the experiment, and *I declare most solemnly that 'towards the close of his life' he had no shadow of belief in so singular a delusion.*"

Comment of ours can add nothing to the force of this testimony—it is conclusive,—unimpeachable,—irresistible. And here we are tempted to lay down our weary pen, for we are heartily sick of this matter, but having put our hand to the plough we will not be accused of looking back.

We have no means of dealing with the Cholera Statistics, and with what is said "of that high-minded man, Dr. MacLoughlin," because we have no opportunity of investigation—neither can we travel into Russia and Bavaria, to see how patients are there cured "by command of government." We merely point to the cases of Dr. Routh and Mr. Liston, which *we have* investigated, and we ask, not with triumph but with distrust, for some *credible witness* to the truth of these assertions, ere we can attach the slightest value to them.

We pass on to the fourth division of our subject,—and we commence with “a brief examination” of the question of retention and accumulation of drugs, which is looked on by Dr. Horner as “a positive evil—insidious yet most serious—inseparable from the old method of cure.”

He tells us that Drs. Christison and Taylor have shewn “that drugs, administered to a patient, permeate every part of the human body, and there lodge for *indefinite periods* of time,—deposited or interwoven as it were, in the internal vital parts or organs.”

He adds, “I shall refer to this subject again, and give you *proof and examples* where not only mineral, but also vegetable drugs, as Aloes, Colocynth, &c., which had been administered some years before, remained deposited in the system; a miserable and wholly shattered state, both of mental and bodily health, being the consequence; but where both were eventually happily restored, by the removal of these latent (and these poisonous) drugs.”

This is stated at page 5, and 40 pages further on he returns to the charge—with what? *Proofs, examples*, as he promised us! No! nothing but a re-assertion of the same things, and almost in the same language. He here says (page 48), “There is no room to doubt, but that the retention and deposition of drugs within the system, is not an uncommon cause of disorders; from a simple feeling of derangement of health, to serious illness.” “The evidence may surprise, but the facts are incontrovertible.” What is the evidence? Who are the witnesses to these *facts*? Taylor or Christison aforesaid! Not exactly. But he tells us that one Dr. Macleod, of Benrhydding (another quack—a Pathist of a different sort), “details some remarkable cases of shattered health from this very cause, and the subsequent recovery of the patients after the perceptible extraction of Mercury, Aloes, Colocynth, &c., from the body;” and records his opinions and belief—on which, it seems, Dr. Horner’s are modelled—“that the cases described illustrate the *fact*” (we are tired of writing this ill-used word) of the retention of drugs, and the ill consequences therefrom arising. And we are coolly told of an Aloetic smell being “washed out of the compresses



that had encircled the body"—near the Axilla, probably—"of some patient." And this is the fulfilment of the promise of *proof and examples* given at page 5.

What preposterous nonsense is this! Macleod asserts that he has "indisputably proved" so and so: Horner re-echoes this is "indisputable evidence," "fact incontrovertible." Where are the cases? Where are the details? Where the records, that we may examine and judge for ourselves? Must we *again* remind Dr. Horner that—assertion is not proof,—repetition is not evidence,—reiteration is not argument.

Here we might rest content with a verdict of "not proven;" but, it may be well, in furtherance of our original design, to give succinctly the present state of our knowledge on this subject.

Drugs, remedially administered in suitable doses, do not remain in the body for any length of time, but pass off in due course by the proper excretions. When administered in *poisonous* doses, they *may* be retained, and accumulate to an injurious extent. But yet, even in these extreme cases, the natural processes are at work for their elimination, and, unless the patient die speedily, they are not chemically recoverable after death. Lodgement for *indefinite periods of time*, so positively spoken of by Dr. Horner, applies to what? Why to the *dead* body, and not the *living*.

If a person *die* with mineral poison in his viscera, it may be detected and realized years after: but, if he live a comparatively short time after its administration, *none* will be found; and it is no uncommon thing for a person to die *absolutely* from the secondary effects of a poison, yet none shall be found after death in any part of his body. This is the sort of evidence we should get from Taylor and Christison—two of the greatest authorities on such matters.\* But it would not suit Dr. Horner's purpose; he prefers the balderdash of Dr. Macleod.

\* "The exact time which is required for Arsenic to be eliminated after its absorption is undetermined." "Jurists assign a period of ten, twelve, or fifteen days for its entire disappearance from the body."  
—Taylor "*On Poisons*."

But what concerns us principally is, Dr. H.'s assertion that this dangerous retention and accumulation "is an evil inseparable from the usual mode of practising medicine," and he furnishes us with, or at least reminds us of—an apt illustration of that difference between a remedy and a poison which we are anxious to demonstrate. At page 47, we read, "We have some idea of the effect of the long continued use of bad water, especially if flowing through leaden pipes or a leaden cistern;"—and this strange sentence follows—"how much *more hurtful* to the delicate organization of our bodies must be the obstructive and contaminating presence of drugs."

What does Dr. Horner mean by this? Is he so ignorant of this subject as not to know that these conditions, which he pretends to contrast, are one and the same thing? Or is he here trying to confuse and mistify a simple and intelligible matter for the bewilderment of the public? Let him choose for himself whichever horn of this dilemma he may prefer.

The effect of the habitual use of water from leaden pipes or a leaden cistern—is to poison a person—with a *drug*—viz., lead which the water has dissolved. It is no unfrequent occurrence, and the symptoms of lead poisoning from this cause, and also from paint, are well known—and they are undoubtedly the effect of accumulation in the system—first colic, next paralysis of the fore-arm, or dropped hand, as it is called. Now lead *is a drug*, in constant use as a medicine, and a very useful remedy it is in many cases, and often prescribed. Its *medicinal* administration *does not* produce these symptoms of poisoning. Yet they *must* of necessity follow, if the *asserted* accumulation really did occur. What better disproof can we desire of Dr. Horner's notion that injurious retention and accumulation are *inseparable* from the use of such remedial agents.

Whilst considering this question of the accumulation of drugs, Dr. Horner takes opportunity to congratulate himself on the mercy he has always shewn to the bowels of other men, even in the days of his headstrong and benighted blinness. Our Doctor is a modest man—a contrite man—an humble man—a very Uriah Heap—he acknowledges many and grievous errors—he confesses "a many things."

Yet is this all sham—it is but a thin and very transparent veil. Each confession of former blindness is outdone by some succeeding boast of present discernment and existing discretion.

'Tis the devil's favorite sin,

The pride which apes humility.

Thus he lays the flattering unction to his soul “that he has ever discouraged what is called the active or heroic treatment of disease.”

This is his own version of the matter, and though we would not heedlessly awake his dormant regrets, or rouse a spectre so serenely and comfortably laid—yet we are bound to state, that it is not in accordance with the evidence of *his own prescriptions*, which can be produced by scores—by druggists and others—who have been in the habit of dispensing for him; amongst whom he has long been notorious for ordering *tremendous* doses of *powerful* medicines, so that in some instances they have even feared that such enormous quantities could scarcely be administered with safety—much less with impunity.

And his pamphlet supplies us with internal evidence in support of this testimony. He says (page 46) that at present our youths are taught that “bleeding is the right arm, and mercury the left arm,” in the treatment of some diseases. Again, in speaking of the rapid recoveries which he assures us take place after the Homœopathic cure, as contrasted with the protracted convalescence of the old system—he says—“For the man has to make up for blood of which he has *in all probability* been drained,” “previously healthy parts have been blistered and burnt, scoured and irritated,” “or the natural functions of various parts are left in a state of irritation or of disorder from *drug disease*.” “Even calomel or blue pill, in children especially, are little stinted.” “The old school practitioner now gives frequent pause *even* to his lancet.”

We are not going about to defend such practice as is here shadowed forth even as against Homœopathy.

We have shewn that *drug disease* is the result of poisonous doses, and *not* of judicious prescription. It is not the fashion of “the enlightened surgeon” of the present day *to drain his patient*



of blood—it is no such great act of forbearance on his part to “give pause to his lancet”—neither does he as a rule calomelize unfortunate infants.

But these are probably mere confessions, mere self accusations, and if such results as he has here recorded, are founded on Dr. Horner's *own experience*—if these observations have been drawn *from his own practice*—then do *we too* join in his just acknowledgments of the advantages of Homœopathy over such mischievous practice as this—we too may confess, as Dr. MacLoughlin is said to have done, that we would rather be in the hands of a Globulist than of such a practitioner as Dr. Horner has been in his day. To such a man the *laissez faire, do-nothing* system Homœopathy is a boon, an escape from greater evils. His present sins of *omission* will be less dangerous than his former ones of *commission*. He is just the man to be converted, and it is probably a good thing for him and for his patients too.

We had noted down for comment a few more of the contradictions and absurdities with which Dr. Horner's pamphlet abounds.

At page 29 we are told that Homœopathy “is replete with a cure not for *one* but for *all diseases*,” yet on the preceeding page we read “that the Homœopath sometimes meets with obstacles which no medical art can surmount,”—and in continuation, though it broaches a distinct question —“but when he is overcome in the conflict, he has at least the satisfaction of doing all that medical art can effect;” and in the note below, “I prescribed Nux Vomica in the dose of a *millionth part of a grain*.” *This is all that medical art could effect!!*

These are too flagrant—too monstrous—to be worthy of serious criticism.

At page 31 is the only little bit of theory on which he ventures. He attempts to explain the action of Homœopathic medicines, which he says “affect only the disturbed and deranged vital actions implicated in disease.” Yet this lady aforesaid, who took the millionth part of a grain of Nux Vomica for *indigestion*, recognised the Strychnia that was therein *by the feeling in the arms* which it pro-

duced. What a delicate chemico-physiological test is the nervous system of this person; she might have been usefully employed in the late cases of poisoning by Strychnia.

At page 40 he speaks of the unanimity of Homœopaths, as if they were all of one mind—"there is no division into sects" he says. Does he not know that on many points every man has his own creed, *Quot homines, tot sententiæ*, is not at all inapplicable to Homœopaths. This that we have just mentioned, is a *questio vexata*, and has been warmly discussed, viz., whether the globules have any action on the healthy body or not? Dr. Horner appears not yet to have made up his mind on this vital topic; but contradicts himself—as we have pointed out.

Blood letting is repeatedly spoken of as a "terrible evil," and so forth. This is a medical question, and cannot be here discussed. Yet we think it right to contradict this nonsense, for the sake of the public mind. And lest it be said that our counter-assertion is but an expression of individual opinion, and that so it becomes merely a point on which doctors differ—we point to the not unfrequent occurrence of considerable losses of blood (dangerous it may be at the time) from various accidental causes, which do not eventually produce such direful consequences, nor even much protract the convalescence of the patient.

Sir John Forbes is mentioned several times as hovering round, and coquetting, with Homœopathy. His only objections to it will be removed and his conversion *must follow* from reading the Doctor's pamphlet. Slightly conceited this notion—scarcely likely to be realized—here is his lately published opinion, from a book Dr. Horner quotes—"Homœopathy is utterly false and despicable."

There is yet one other point that deserves serious consideration.

Dr. Horner denounces in no measured terms the opposition offered to Homœopathy by the profession; forgetting, meanwhile, that such imputations might suggest comparisons unfavourable to himself. All this rage and vituperation comes with very ill-grace from one who, not long ago, clamored for the expulsion of Dr. Henderson from his professorial chair, because he had embraced Homœopathy.

To say that this arose from blindness and ignorance does not mend the matter—nor is it to the purpose. What we want to know is—was *he* then sincere? If so, we may surely venture to suggest to him, that it is *just possible* that this sincerity of belief may be the moving principle of some whom even *his* book has failed to convince of the error of their ways.

We have elsewhere given at some length our estimate of the professional value of this book, and our reasons for believing that its medical testimony is of nothing worth, and we have earnestly and honestly besought him for that further information which he says he could give us if he chose, and which he assures us “must be sufficient to convince every candid mind.”

Perhaps he will remember this in that second edition with which rumour threatens us; and he may also think it worth his while to explain what he means, when he speaks of “the alarm now pervading the ranks of the profession that their craft is in danger.” Do patients, who trust in globules, shun their medical adviser—do they pay infinitesimal fees—or would the pecuniary, or other interests of the profession, be likely to suffer injury from the general adoption of the practice of Homœopathy? We trow not if the thing itself were true.

Besides all this—patients die daily—aye, even medical men and their nearest and dearest relatives, are subject to painful and mortal disease. For the sake of *these*, then, and of *themselves*, how gladly would they hail the advent of Homœopathy, or any other style of pathy “really and truly replete with a cure for every disease.” To say nothing of that anxiety for the public weal—that high and humane spirit of universal philanthropy which has been so often exhibited by—and which public opinion justly accords to—the noble profession to which we are proud to belong—which would not allow us one moment to hesitate in the adoption of any better system than our own—imperfect and uncertain, as it really is—and as we fear it is likely to remain—spite of either Hahnemann or Horner.

Is Homœopathy *that better* system? That is the great question which Dr. Horner has undertaken to prove in the affirmative—and

he may believe us when we say, he has utterly and entirely failed. He need not feel aggrieved when we tell him, that wiser and cleverer men than he have written on this subject, and have attempted the same task at which he has "tried his 'prentice hand." Yet, notwithstanding all that he and they have as yet said on this subject, we, in common with a large majority of our medical brethren, are still unconvinced.

We must go further than this, and we say of Homœopathy "the deceits are too open and flagrant—the inconsistencies and contrivances too monstrous—it is hard even to sympathize with persons who receive them as genuine,"—and speaking for ourselves individually, we are compelled to state that it is an absolute impossibility to bring our own mind to believe in the sincerity of a *Medical Homœopath*. We can concede him this much. He may have so little faith in medicine and in our knowledge of disease and of remedies, that he considers it better to *leave everything to nature*—which is falsely styled *Homœopathy*. But that he credits the doctrines of Hahnemann, we cannot believe of any *sane* man, who *has received a medical education*.

This being at present the prevalent feeling of the profession, Dr. Horner has, *by adopting Homœopathy*, gone beyond the pale of honourable medicine. He has been driven from the Infirmary—he will shortly be expelled from what he ridiculously styles "his *perpetual* Vice-Presidentship of the British Medical Association," and his former medical associates can no longer hold with him professional intercourse. But by *the publication of his disgraceful and unprofessional pamphlet*, he has degraded himself to the position of the lowest advertising quack.

We are not surprised to find that the notorious Hamilton publicly hails him as a brother, and calls upon him as a friend, and we finish with the concluding words of a brochure we formerly published on this subject, and which appears to have exactly foreshadowed this case of Dr. Horner,—and we say, "with these men," therefore, he must now take his stand, for such is his true position. Though he may still parade his diplomas obtained from Examiners and

Professors, whose doctrines and teachings he repudiates and scorns; and though he may still claim fellowship with schools and colleges that he has forsaken and disgraced,—yet he belongs not to the order of legitimate medicine, but to the ranks of charlatanry and quackery.

FINIS.